

# Lies and Ignorance of Hizb at-Tahrîr

**In the Sciences of Ḥadîth  
and the Arabic Language**

Abû Tâlût  
Haytham Âl Sayfaddîn

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

One may ask: “Why focus on these points when there are greater issues within the *Ummah* today?” or “Why focus on these issues when this group has far greater deviations than those addressed within these pages?” I say: Both of these points are valid, without any doubt. However, this essay is a response to a request from a dear Brother in *Islâm*. Had it not been for his request, may Allâh Preserve him, I would not have busied myself with the likes of this group. And his request for these points to be addressed is a valid request, as this group and the individuals addressed within this essay present themselves as being well grounded in the Sciences of *Islâm*. However, as will be made painfully clear, even some of their scholars and students of knowledge are lacking, even in the basics. What’s more, they accuse others of not being well researched and not having knowledge about the matters they discuss.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

As-Salâmu 'Alaykum Wa Rahmatullâhi Wa Barakâtuh,

After reading the material you sent and your request related to it, I say the following:

This individual you referred to; Mazin Abdul-Adhim, claimed: “If you wish to choose the definition where anyone who merely saw the Prophet (saw) is magically transformed into a Sahabi - ignoring the fact that many people who saw the Prophet (saw) while they were Muslim still apostatized after his death, which proves that seeing the Prophet (saw) does not automatically transform one into someone at the calibre of a Sahabi - then you are free to do so, but don't pretend that this opinion is grounded in the Quran and Sunnah. This opinion is a mystical assumption about the effect of seeing the Prophet (saw) and actually has no basis in the texts of Islam. If you believe it has a basis in the texts of the Quran and Sunnah, feel free to quote the Ayah or Hadith that proves it.”

## Textual Evidence

Imâm al-Bukhârî stated: “Book: The Virtues of the *Sâhâbah*: Chapter: The Virtues of the *Aş'âhab* of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, or saw him, then he is from his companions.”

He then narrated the following *Hadîth* as Evidence:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ حَدَّثَنَا سُفِيَّانُ عَنْ عَمِّرٍو قَالَ سَعَفْتُ جَابِرَ بْنَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا يَقُولُ حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو سَعِيدِ الْخُدْرِيِّ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: "يُأْتِي عَلَى النَّاسِ زَمَانٌ فَيَغْزُو فِتَّاقٌ مِّنَ النَّاسِ فَيَقُولُونَ فِيْكُمْ مَنْ صَاحِبَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَيَقُولُونَ نَعَمْ ثُمَّ يُأْتِي عَلَى النَّاسِ زَمَانٌ فَيَغْزُو فِتَّاقٌ مِّنَ النَّاسِ فَيُقَالُ هَلْ فِيْكُمْ مَنْ صَاحِبَ أَصْحَابَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَيَقُولُونَ نَعَمْ فَيُفْتَحُ لَهُمْ ثُمَّ يُأْتِي عَلَى النَّاسِ زَمَانٌ فَيَغْزُو فِتَّاقٌ مِّنَ النَّاسِ فَيُقَالُ هَلْ فِيْكُمْ مَنْ صَاحِبَ أَصْحَابَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَيَقُولُونَ نَعَمْ فَيُفْتَحُ لَهُمْ ثُمَّ

'Alî Ibn 'Abdillâh told us: Sufyân told us: On the authority of 'Amr who said: I heard Jâbir Ibn 'Abdillâh, who said: Abû Sa'îd al-Khudrî told us, saying: The Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said: “A time will come upon the people when groups of people will set out to fight in the Path of Allâh and it will be said to them: ‘Is there amongst you anyone who accompanied the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?’ Then they will say: ‘Yes.’ So, they will be victorious. Then, groups of people will set out to fight in the Path of Allâh and it will be said to them: ‘Is there amongst you anyone who accompanied anyone of the Companions of the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?’ Then, they will say: ‘Yes.’ So, they will be victorious. Then, groups of people will set out to fight in the Path of Allâh and it will be said to them: ‘Is there amongst you anyone who

*accompanied anyone who accompanied anyone of the Companions of the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? Then they will say: 'Yes.' Then, victory will be granted to them."*

And in the narration of *Imâm Muslim*:

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو حَيْثَمَةَ زَهِيرُ بْنُ حَرْبٍ وَاللَّفْظُ لِزَهِيرٍ وَأَحْمَدُ بْنُ عَبْدَةَ الصَّيْعَى قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا سُفْيَانُ بْنُ عَيْنِيَّةَ قَالَ: سَمِعَ عَمْرُو جَابِرًا يُخْبِرُ عَنْ أَبِي سَعِيدِ الْخُدْرِيِّ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ: "يَأْتِي عَلَى النَّاسِ زَمَانٌ يَغْرُو فِتَنٌ مِنَ النَّاسِ فَيُقَالُ لَهُمْ: فِيْكُمْ مَنْ رَأَى رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ؟ فَيَقُولُونَ: نَعَمْ فَيُفْتَحُ لَهُمْ مِمَّ يَغْرُو فِتَنٌ مِنَ النَّاسِ فَيُقَالُ لَهُمْ: فِيْكُمْ مَنْ رَأَى مِنْ صَاحِبِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ؟ فَيَقُولُونَ: نَعَمْ فَيُفْتَحُ لَهُمْ مِمَّ يَغْرُو فِتَنٌ مِنَ النَّاسِ فَيُقَالُ لَهُمْ: هَلْ فِيْكُمْ مَنْ رَأَى مِنْ صَاحِبِ مِنْ صَاحِبِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ؟ فَيَقُولُونَ: نَعَمْ فَيُفْتَحُ لَهُمْ".

Abû Khaythamah Zuhayr Ibn Ḥarb told us – and the phrase is his – and Aḥmad Ibn ‘Abdah adh-Dhabbâ both said: Sufyân Ibn ‘Uayynah told us saying: ‘Amr heard Jâbir informing on the authority of Abû Sa’id al-Khudrî: On the authority of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, who said: “*A time will come upon the people when groups of people will set out to fight in the Path of Allâh and it will be said to them: 'Is there amongst you anyone who saw the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?' Then they will say: 'Yes.' So, they will be victorious. Then groups of people will set out to fight in the Path of Allâh and it will be said to them: 'Is there one amongst you who saw those who accompanied the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?' Then they will say: 'Yes.' So, they will be victorious. Then groups of people will set out to fight in the Path of Allâh and it will be said to them: 'Is there amongst you anyone who saw anyone who accompanied anyone who accompanied the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?' Then they will say: 'Yes.' Then, victory will be granted to them.*”

Here we have two narrations. One mentions “*Şâhiba* (Accompanied)” for each generation. The second narration mentions “...saw...” for a generation, then the subsequent generation is asked whether they accompanied those who “saw”, and so on.

If one says they are two separate *Aḥâdîth*, then we see that in each, the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, used “*Şâhiba* (Accompanied)” and “saw” interchangeably when referring to these groups of people.

And if one says that they are the exact same *Hadîth*, and that it was narrated in one case verbatim and another case by meaning, this shows that the linguistic meaning of “*Şâhiba* (Accompanied)” is fulfilled by the act of seeing someone.

One may also use the following Verse:

{مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحْمَاءُ بَيْتِهِمْ}

**{Muhammad is the Messenger of Allâh; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves.} Sûrat al-Fat'h, 29**

There is no doubt that this Verse is regarding the Companions and no one else. And if we look at someone who saw the Prophet while he believed in him, then they were: 1. With him in the same era; 2. With him in the same place; 3. With him on the same Religion. So, for someone to come and say that they were with him in all of these things, but were not with him for a long enough period or were not with him for a sufficient number of times, etc. is something that has no Textual basis nor any basis in the language of the 'Arab. In fact, it is in contradiction to the Texts and the language of the 'Arab.

So, while they may not have seen these Texts, saw them but did not understand how they were used, or don't accept the *Ahâdîth* because they do not reach their falsified standards of what *Ahâdîth* are accepted; all of these possibilities prove their lack of knowledge, research and honesty.

## Linguistics

This individual you referred to; Mazin Abdul-Adhim, said: "**We define a Sahabi as someone who fulfills the linguistic meaning of a 'companion.'**"

And he said: "...whereas our opinion is at least based on the linguistic meaning of *Suhba* (companionship)."

I say: This claim is a disaster, in and of itself, and would be laughable had it not been so sad. It appears that this individual did what many do when discussing matters related to rulings based upon the Arabic language; they take the translated meaning in English and apply it to the Arabic language and assume this fulfills the claim of "linguistic meaning". Or, they take the way a word is used in Arabic today and apply this understanding to the way it was used by the early generations. And it is likely that he followed this second method, because this is what was done by his predecessors within his party, as will be seen.

I say: Ibn Abî Shaybah said:

حَدَّثَنَا شَبَابَةُ عَنْ شُعْبَةَ عَنْ أَبِي التَّيَّاحِ قَالَ: سَمِعْتُ حُمَرَانَ بْنَ أَبَانَ يُحَدِّثُ عَنْ مُعَاوِيَةَ أَنَّهُ نَظَرَ إِلَى أَنَّاسٍ يُصَلِّونَ بَعْدَ الْعَصْرِ. فَقَالَ: إِنَّكُمْ تُصَلِّونَ صَلَاتَةً قَدْ صَحِبْنَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَمَا رأَيْنَاهُ يُصَلِّيهَا وَقَدْ نَهَى عَنْهَا.

Shabâbah told us: On the authority of Shu'bah: On the authority of Abit-Tayyâh who said: I heard Ḥumrân Ibn Abân narrating on the authority of Mu'âwiyah: That he looked at some people who were performing *Salât* after Al-'Aşr, so he said: "Indeed, you are performing a *Şalât* which we did not see being performed by the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, when we accompanied (Şahibnâ) him and he had forbidden it.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Narrated by Ibn Abî Shaybah (#7,404), Ahmad (#17,032), Al-Bukhârî (#587) and Abû Ya'lâ (#7,360)

Here, we have someone from the ‘Arab, in fact, from Quraysh, within *Zamân al-Ihtijâj* (The Era of Proof) using the word “*Şâhibnâ*” about this type of seeing, meeting and/or interaction. And this is what is considered proof for a matter in the Arabic language; that it was used by an Arab within *Zamân al-Ihtijâj*, as that is when the language of the ‘Arab remained unaltered.

Therefore, Mu’âwiyah was either lying, or he did not know the language of the ‘Arab as well as these people. And I challenge anyone to prove either of these claims.

And *Imâm Al-Bukhârî* said:

حَدَّثَنَا الْحَسَنُ بْنُ يَشْرِي حَدَّثَنَا الْمُعَاوَى عَنْ عُثْمَانَ بْنِ الْأَسْوَدِ عَنْ أَبِي مُلِيْكَةَ قَالَ أَوْتَرَ مُعاوِيَةً بَعْدَ الْعِشَاءِ بِرُكْعَةٍ وَعِنْدَهُ مَوْلَى لِابْنِ عَبَّاسٍ فَأَتَى ابْنَ عَبَّاسٍ فَقَالَ دَعْهُ فَإِنَّهُ قَدْ صَاحَبَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

Al-Hasan Ibn Bishr told us: Al-Mu’âfâ told us: On the authority of ‘Uthmân Ibn al-Aswad: On the authority of Ibn Abî Mulaykah who said: “Mu’âwiyah performed *Witr* after *Al-‘Ishâ’* with one *Rak’ah*, and with him was a servant of Ibn ‘Abbâs. Then he (i.e. the servant) came to Ibn ‘Abbâs (i.e. and mentioned what he saw), so he (i.e. Ibn ‘Abbâs) said: “Leave him, as he accompanied (*Şâhiba*) the Messenger of Allâh<sup>2</sup>”. صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

Here, we have another individual from the ‘Arab, in fact, another individual from Quraysh, during *Zamâm al-Ihtijâj*, who was also one of the greatest Scholars amongst the *Şâhabah*, referring to Mu’âwiyah as having accompanied (*Şâhiba*) Messenger of Allâh. صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Now, one of these individuals may attempt to claim that there is a difference between saying someone accompanied someone and someone being someone else’s companion. However, this would be an open lie, as nearly any book of the Sciences of the Arabic language would prove. This is because the verb is “*Şâhiba*” and its derivatives while the noun and/or adjective is “*Şâhib*” and its derivatives.

And *Imâm Ibn Hazm* (d. 456 H.) said: “And a people have said: One who sees the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, one time would not be a Companion until his companionship (with him) repeats. Abû Muhammad says: And, with certainty, this is a mistake, because it is a statement without any proof. Then we ask the one who says this about the number of times for which he mentioned and the amount of time which is needed. Then if he places a specific amount on that, then this is an additional amount of arbitrary falsehood. And if he does not find a specific amount for that, then he is someone who has said something about which he has no knowledge. And that is a sufficient amount of misguidance. And the proof, as well, for the falseness of his statement, is that the noun ‘*Şuhbah* (Accompaniment)’ linguistically merely applies to one who joins someone by the end of any situation, so he has accompanied him in it. Therefore, since one who saw the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, while he was not opposing him nor was he rejecting of his

<sup>2</sup> “*Şâhib al-Bukhârî*”, (#3,764)

Prophethood, has accompanied him during that time, it is obligatory for him to be called a ‘Şâhib’.”<sup>3</sup>

And *Imâm An-Nawawî* (d. 676 H.) stated: “The *Imâm Al-Qâdhî Abu-Tayyib al-Bâqillânî* stated: ‘There is no dispute amongst the People of Language (i.e. the linguists) that ‘Aş-Şâhabî’ is derived from ‘As-Şuhbah’; it applies to anyone who accompanied someone else; whether for a small amount or a great amount. It is said: ‘Şâhibahu’ (i.e. He accompanied him) for a month and a day and an hour.’ And this obligates, by ruling with the language, the application of this upon anyone who accompanied the Prophet, ﷺ, even for an hour. And this is the default’ He said: ‘And despite this, a custom developed within the *Ummah* that they do not use it except regarding one whose accompaniment was a great amount and whose meeting was lengthy. And that is not applicable to one who met with an individual for an hour, walked with him and heard a *Hadîth* from him. Therefore, it is obligatory to not be applied to except to those whose situations are like this.’ These are the words of *Al-Qâdhî*, about whom there is consensus regarding his trustworthiness and his greatness. And in it there is an affirmation of the two schools of thought. And it is used as proof that the school of thought of the *Muḥaddithîn* is correct. This is because this *Imâm* mentioned from the people of language that the noun applies to accompaniment for an hour and more. And most of the People of *Hadîth* mention usage in the *Sharî‘ah* and the customs (of the *Ummah*) which matches the linguistic usage, so it is obligatory to go to that. And Allâh Knows Best.”<sup>4</sup>

So, we see here that even *Al-Bâqillânî*, who disagreed with a *Şâhabî* being someone who merely saw the Prophet, ﷺ, did not dispute that linguistically, this is correct. In fact, he mentioned that this is a matter of consensus amongst the Scholars of the Arabic language.

And the linguist, *Abul-‘Abbâs al-Fayyûmî* (d. 770 H.) said: “The default is that this applies to one who saw and was in the company (of someone else). And beyond that, the Scholars of *Uṣûl* have conditions.”<sup>5</sup>

And the words of the *Imâms* of the Language of the ‘Arab, such as *Ibn Fâris* (d. 395 H.),<sup>6</sup> *Ibn Sîdah* (d. 458 H.),<sup>7</sup> *Ibn Manthûr* (d. 711 H.),<sup>8</sup> *Al-Fayrûzabâdî* (d. 817 H.)<sup>9</sup> and others<sup>10</sup> all indicate that the definition revolves around meeting, interacting and proximity. So, when one is placed in the dilemma of having to choose between one definition given by all of the Scholars of the Arabic language and one given by individuals from *Hizb at-Tahrîr*, to me, at least, the choice seems clear.

<sup>3</sup> “Al-Ihkâm Fî Uṣûl al-Ahkâm”, Vol. 5/665

<sup>4</sup> “Al-Minhâj Sharh Şâhih Muslim Ibn al-Hajjâj”, Vol. 1/35.

<sup>5</sup> “Al-Mîsbâh al-Munîr Fî Gharîb ash-Sharh al-Kabîr”, pg. 333

<sup>6</sup> “Mu’jam Maqâyîs al-Lughah”, Vol. 3/335

<sup>7</sup> “Al-Muḥkam”, Vol. 3/119

<sup>8</sup> “Lisân al-‘Arab”, Vol. 1/519

<sup>9</sup> “Al-Qâmûs al-Muhiṭ”, Vol. 1/91

<sup>10</sup> “Al-Mu’jam al-Wasît”, Vol. 1/507, “Al-Ifsâh Fî Fiqh al-Lughah”, pg. 708

## What Is Their Proof for Their Claim?

Their founder and first *Amîr*, Taqiyuddîn an-Nabahânî said: “And the Scholars of *Hadîth* say that anyone who saw the Prophet, ﷺ, and believed in him is a *Şâhâbî*. However, the truth is that the *Şâhâbî* is anyone upon whom the meaning of *Şuhbah* can be applied. On the authority of Sa’îd ibn al-Musayyib:

لَا بدَ أَنْ يَصْحِبَهُ سَنَةً أَوْ سَنْتَيْنِ أَوْ يَغْزُو مَعَهُ غَرْوَةً أَوْ غَرْوَتَيْنِ.

“He must accompany him for a year or two or battle alongside him in a battle or two.”

وروى شعبة عن موسى السبلاني - وأثنى عليه خيرا - قال: قلت لأنس بن مالك فقلت: هل بقي من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أحد غيرك؟ قال: بقي ناس من الأعراب رأوه. فأما من صحبه فلا.

And Shu’bah narrated: On the authority of Mûsâ as-Sabulânî – and he praised him with good – who said: I said to Anas ibn Mâlik: “Is there anyone remaining from amongst the Companions of the Messenger of Allâh, ﷺ, other than you?” He said: ‘There remains people from amongst the Bedouins who saw him. As for those who accompanied him, then no.’”<sup>11</sup>

And from another of their publications: “The *Şâhâbî* and all those whom the meaning of *Şuhbah* is present in – and it has been explained that if he accompanies the Prophet, ﷺ, for a year or two, and battles alongside him in a battle or two...”<sup>12</sup>

And this individual you referred to; Mazin Abdul-Adhim, said: “If someone lived with the Prophet (saw) one or two years or fought one or two battles alongside him, then that person is objectively a companion to the Prophet (saw). If Mu’awiyah fits this description, then he is a Sahabi, and if he doesn’t, then he isn’t. It’s not a personal attack against anyone the same as saying that Imam Malik was not a Sahabi is not a personal attack, rather it is an objective fact. This opinion is the same opinion as the master of the Tabi’een, Sa’eed ibn Al-Musayyab. Some people need to learn to study topics in more depth, and put their emotions aside, and not talk about topics without properly understanding them.”

I say: These points further demonstrate their ignorance of the Sciences of *Hadîth*, or their outright dishonesty. Furthermore, nowhere did they give any reference to where this narration can be found nor did they prove its authenticity. And this could either be due to their inability to provide the reference, their inability to prove its authenticity, their belief that’s their words should be accepted without question or their knowledge that it is not authentic.

Al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî (d. 463 H.) said:

<sup>11</sup> “Ash-Shâkhshîyyah al-Islâmiyyah”, Vol 1/323

<sup>12</sup> “Al-Malaff al-Fikrî”, pg. 148

أَخْبَرَنِي الْحُسَيْنُ بْنُ أَبِي الْحَسِينِ الْوَرَاقُ ثَا عُمَرُ بْنُ أَحْمَدَ الْوَاعِظُ ثَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ ثَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَزِيدَ عَنِ الْحَارِثِ عَنِ ابْنِ سَعْدٍ عَنِ الْوَاقِدِيِّ مُحَمَّدُ بْنِ عُمَرَ قَالَ: أَخْبَرَنِي طَلْحَةُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ سَعِيدٍ بْنِ الْمُسَيْبٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ قَالَ: كَانَ سَعِيدُ بْنُ الْمُسَيْبٍ يَقُولُ: "الصَّحَابَةُ لَا نَعْدُهُمْ إِلَّا مَنْ أَقَامَ مَعَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ سَنَةً أَوْ سَنَتَيْنِ وَغَزَّ مَعَهُ عَزْوَةً أَوْ عَزْوَتَيْنِ".

Al-Ḥusayn Ibn Abil-Ḥasan al-Warrāq informed me: ‘Umar Ibn Aḥmad al-Wâ’ith told us: Muḥammad Ibn Ibrâhîm told us: Muḥammad Ibn Yazîd told us: On the authority of Al-Ḥârith: On the authority of Ibn Sa’d: On the authority of Al-Wâqidî Muḥammad Ibn ‘Umar who said: Talḥah Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Sa’id Ibn al-Musayyib informed us: On the authority of his father who said: Sa’id Ibn al-Musayyib used to say: “The Ṣâḥâbah; we do not consider them except for those who lived with the Messenger of *Islâm*, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, for a year or two and battled alongside him in a battle or two.”<sup>13</sup>

As we see from the chain, it contains three defects.

1. It contains Muḥammad Ibn ‘Umar al-Wâqidî.<sup>14</sup>

Is’ḥâq Ibn Râhûyah (d. 238 H.) said: “In my opinion, he is from amongst those who fabricate.”

Al-Bukhârî (d. 256 H.) said: “I do not have one letter from him. And that from his *Hadîth* which I know, I am not convinced by. He is gone.”

Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjâj (d. 261 H.), Abû Zur’ah ar-Râzî (d. 264 H.) and Abû Bishr ad-Dûlâbî (d. 310 H.) all stated: “*Matrûk al-Hadîth* (His *Aḥâdîth* are abandoned).”

Abû Dâwûd (d. 275 H.) stated: “I do not write down his *Aḥâdîth* and I do not narrate from him. I do not doubt that he used to make up *Aḥâdîth*.”

An-Nasâ’î (d. 303 H.) stated: “The liars who were known to lie on the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, were four: Al-Wâqidî in Al-Madînah...”

2. It contains Ṭalḥah Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Sa’id Ibn al-Musayyib who is *Majhûl* (Unknown). We have nothing about him from the early Scholars of *Hadîth*, other than Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî stating: “I do not know him.”<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, only one person is listed in the books of men as having narrated from him; Muḥammad Ibn Ismâ’îl Ibn Muslim Ibn Dînâr.

<sup>13</sup> “*Al-Kifâyah Fî ‘Ilm ar-Riwayah*”, pg. 68-69

<sup>14</sup> “*At-Târîkh al-Kabîr*”, Vol. 1/178 and “*At-Târîkh as-Saghîr*”, pg. 109, both by Al-Bukhârî, “*Al-Jarh Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 8/20-21, “*Adh-Dhu’afâ’*” by Al-‘Uqaylî, (#1,666), “*Târîkh Baghdâd*”, by Al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî, Vol. 3/16, “*Adh-Dhu’afâ’ Wal-Matrûkîn*” by An-Nasâ’î, pg. 233, “*Adh-Dhu’afâ’*” by Abû Nu’aym, pg. 146, “*Su’âlât al-Bartha’î Li’Abî Zur’ah*”, 511, “*Asâmî adh-Dhu’afâ’*” by Abû Zur’ah, 656, “*Al-Majrûhîn Min al-Muḥaddithîn*”, Vol. 2/290 and elsewhere.

<sup>15</sup> “*Al-Jarh Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 4/476

3. It contains Muhammad ibn Sa'îd ibn al-Musayyib who is also *Majhûl* (Unknown). We have nothing about him from the early Scholars of *Hadîth*. The most we have from him is that Ibn Hibbân mentioned him in his book “*Ath-Thuqât*”.<sup>16</sup> However, as I've mentioned numerous times before, all this means is he did not find anyone mentioning any criticism of him.

And what clarifies the weakness even more is that in the books of men, under the biographies of Al-Wâqidî, Tâlîhah ibn Muhammad ibn Sa'îd ibn al-Musayyib is not listed amongst his *Shaykhs*. Likewise, in the books of men, under the biographies of Tâlîhah ibn Muhammad ibn Sa'îd ibn al-Musayyib, Al-Wâqidî is not included amongst his students.

So, their main “proof” other than their made-up claim about the Arabic language is a statement attributed to a *Tâbiî*, and literally every part of the chain is defective.

About the narration of Anas:

The narration given by An-Nabahânî is taken from Ibn aş-Şalâh. Ibn aş-Şalâh said:

وَرَوَيْنَا عَنْ شُعْبَةَ عَنْ مُوسَى السَّبَلَانِيِّ - وَأَتَيْتُ أَنَسَ بْنَ مَالِكٍ فَقُلْتُ: هَلْ بَقَيَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَحَدٌ غَيْرَكَ؟ قَالَ: "بَقَيَ نَاسٌ مِنَ الْأَعْرَابِ قَدْ رَأَوْهُ فَمَمَّا مَنْ صَحِبَهُ فَلَا." إِسْنَادُهُ جَيِّدٌ. حَدَّثَ بِهِ مُسْلِمٌ بِحَضْرَةِ أَبِي زُرْعَةَ.

And we had narrated to us: On the authority of Shu'bah: On the authority of Mûsâ as-Sabalânî – and he praised him with good – who said: ‘I came to Anas ibn Mâlik and said: ‘Is there anyone remaining from amongst the Companions of the Messenger of Allâh, ﷺ, other than you?’ He said: ‘There remains people from amongst the Bedouins who saw him. As for those who accompanied him, then no.’’ Its chain of narration is “*Jayyid*”. Muslim narrated it in the presence of Abû Zur'ah.<sup>17</sup>

And Al-Hâfiث al-'Irâqî attributed it to Ibn Sa'd in “*At-Tabaqât*”. However, with the name “As-Saylânî”.<sup>18</sup>

And on the same page, when commenting on this, Dr. 'Abdul-La'tîf al-Hamîm and *Shaykh Mâhir Yâsîn al-Fâhl* said: “In ‘*Tahthîb al-Kamâl*’: ((As-Sunbulânî)). And in some of the books of terminology: ((As-Sabalânî)). Look to ‘*Maħâsin al-Iṣṭilâh*’, 426, ‘*Ikhtîṣâr 'Ulûm al-Hadîth*’, 2/494 (with *Sharḥ al-Bâ'ith*).”

And they also said on the same page: “And we did not find it in the ‘*At-Tabaqât*’ which was published. And Al-Mizzî narrated it in ‘*Tahthîb al-Kamâl*’, 3/376 pub. 98.”

<sup>16</sup> Vol. 7/421

<sup>17</sup> “*'Ulûm al-Hadîth*”, pg. 146

<sup>18</sup> “*Sharḥ at-Tabṣirah Wat-Tathkirah*”, Vol. 2/124

And Badr ad-Dîn al-'Aynî mentioned his *Shaykh* mentioned it and attributed it to Ibn Sa'd. However, with the name "As-Sînânî".<sup>19</sup>

And *Shaykh 'Abdullâh* Ibn 'Abdir-Rahmân as-Sa'd mentioned that it was narrated by Ibn Sa'd, but attributed it to "Tahthîb al-Kamâl" as well.<sup>20</sup>

On top of this, the phrasing in "Sharh at-Tabâsirah Wat-Tathkirah" is:

"قَدْ بَقِيَ قَوْمٌ مِنَ الْأَعْرَابِ . فَإِنَّمَا مِنْ أَصْحَابِهِ فَإِنَّا آخِرُ مَنْ بَقِيَ ."

"A people from the Bedouins remain. As for those from his Companions, then I am the last who remains."

And the same phrasing is mentioned by As-Suyûtî.<sup>21</sup>

And As-Sakhâwî<sup>22</sup> mentioned:

"قَدْ بَقِيَ قَوْمٌ مِنَ الْأَعْرَابِ . فَإِنَّمَا أَصْحَابُهُ فَإِنَّا آخِرُهُمْ ."

"A people from the Bedouins remain. As for his Companions, then I am the last of them."

And in his footnote to this narration, 'Alî Hüsayn 'Alî said: "Collected by Ibn 'Asâkir in "Târîkh Madînat Dimashq", 3/176. And Al-Mizzî mentioned it in "Tahthîb al-Kamâl" 3/376, attributing it to Ibn Sa'd. However, we did not come across it in "Aṭ-Tabaqât". In fact, I am certain that this biography is clearly incomplete." Vol. 4/86

And if we look to what Ibn 'Asâkir said, we find:

أَخْبَرَنَا أَبُو بَكْرُ الْأَنْصَارِيُّ نَا أَبُو مُحَمَّدُ الْجُوهَرِيُّ أَنَّ أَبُو عُمَرَ بْنَ حَيَّةَ أَنَّا حَمْدُ بْنُ مَعْرُوفٍ حَدَّثَنَا الْحُسَيْنُ بْنُ الْفَهْمِ أَنَّا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ سَعْدٍ أَنَا عَلَيَّ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ عَنْ شُعْبَةَ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ السُّنْبُلَانِيِّ قَالَ: أَتَيْتُ أَنَّاسَ بْنَ مَالِكٍ فَقُلْتُ: "أَنْتَ آخِرُ مَنْ بَقِيَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ؟" قَالَ: "قَدْ بَقِيَ قَوْمٌ مِنَ الْأَعْرَابِ . فَإِنَّمَا مِنْ أَصْحَابِهِ فَإِنَّا آخِرُ مَنْ بَقِيَ ."

Abû Bakr al-Anṣârî informed us: Abû Muḥammad al-Jawharî informed us: Abû 'Umar Ibn Ḥayawayh transmitted to us: Aḥmad Ibn Ma'rûf transmitted to us: Al-Hüsayn Ibn al-Fahm told us: Muḥammad Ibn Sa'd transmitted to us: 'Alî Ibn Muḥammad transmitted to us: On the authority of Shu'bah: On the authority of Muḥammad as-Sunbulânî who said: "I came to Anas Ibn Mâlik and said: 'You are the last of the Companions of the Messenger of Allâh?' He said: 'A people from the Bedouins remain. As for his Companions, then I am the last that remains.'"

Aḥmad Ibn Ma'rûf is either:

<sup>19</sup> "Umdat al-Qârî Sharh Şâhîh al-Bukhârî", Vol. 16/235

<sup>20</sup> "Fat'h al-Wâhid al-'Alî Fid-Difâ' 'An Şâhâbat an-Nabî", pg. 28

<sup>21</sup> "Tadrîb ar-Râwî Fî Sharh Taqrîb an-Nawâwî", Vol. 1/123

<sup>22</sup> "Fat'h al-Mughîth Bi-Sharh Alfiyyat al-Hadîth Lil-'Irâqî", Vol. 4/86

Aḥmad Ibn Ma'rūf Ibn Bishr Ibn Mūsā; he was only declared *Thiqah* by Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463 H.). Only Ibn Ḥayawayh and 'Abdullāh Ibn Yūsuf Ibn 'Abdullāh Ibn Yūsuf Ibn Muḥammad narrated from him.

Or:

Aḥmad Ibn Ma'rūf Ibn Muḥammad. Only declared *Thiqah* by Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463 H.). Only Ibn Ḥayawayh narrated from him.

In either case, these are not narrators whose narration would be authenticated, particularly when they are of such a late generation.

Al-Ḥusayn Ibn al-Fahm is Ḥusayn Ibn Muḥammad Ibn 'Abdir-Rahmān Ibn Fahm.

Abū 'Abdillāh *al-Ḥākim* (d. 405 H.) said: "*Thiqah Ma'mūn ḥāfiθ*."

And Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463 H.) said: "He was *Thiqah*."

However, Ad-Dâraqutnî (d. 385 H.) and Abū 'Abdillāh *al-Ḥākim* (d. 405 H.) both said: "*Laysa Bil-Qawiy* (He is not strong)."

And here, there is no doubt that those who weakened him are given precedent. This is because Ad-Dâraqutnî is the earliest out of them all and the most knowledgeable concerning the defects of *Hadīth*.

*Shaykh 'Abdullāh as-Sa'd* mentioned <sup>23</sup> the following ten points:

- Mūsā does not have any narrations from Anas in the Six Books, nor in the Ten, nor in "Al-Ahādīth al-Mukhtārah" by Dhiyā' ad-Dīn al-Maqdisī despite him having gone to great lengths in mentioning the narrations of Anas.
- It appears he does not have any narrations from Anas except this and one other narration about what he saw in Anas' home.
- He does not appear to have any *Marfū'* narrations. And this is supported by the fact that the author of "Tārīkh Wāsiṭ" said in his introduction to the biography of Anas that he would mention a *Hadīth* for each person who narrated from Anas from the people of Wāsiṭ. And when it came to Mūsā, all he narrated was what has passed. Someone who is like this.
- Shu'bāh may be the only person who narrated from him.

---

<sup>23</sup> "Fat'h al-Wāhid al-'Alī Fid-Difā' 'An Ṣahābat an-Nabī ﷺ", pg. 27-31

- Al-Bukhârî did not mention anything about him in “*At-Târîh al-Kabîr*”.
- Ibn Hibbân did not mentioned anything about him in “*Ath-Thuqât*”.
- His father’s name was not mentioned.
- There is a dispute about his attribution.
- As for the *Tawthîq* of Yaḥyâ, then it is perhaps due to the praise of Shu’bah, otherwise, he does not have any narrations by which his condition can be verified.
- The narrator from Shu’bah who is ‘Alî Ibn Muḥammad – and I believe he is Al-Madâ’înî, as Ibn Sa’d narrated a great deal from him and he is mentioned amongst the narrators from Shu’bah; Yaḥyâ Ibn Ma’în said: “*Thiqah, Thiqah, Thiqah*.” However, Ibn ‘Adî said: “He is not strong in *Hadîth*.” “*Al-Kâmil Fî Dhu’afâ’ ar-Rijâl*”, Vol. 5/1855.

I asked *Shaykh* Ibrâhîm al-Lâhim about this narration and whether he knows anything about it, to which he replied: “I do not know anything about it. And the manuscripts of ‘*At-Tabaqât*’ vary. And who is this ‘Alî Ibn Muḥammad?’

I explained what *Shaykh* ‘Abdullâh as-Sa’d said, to which he replied: “It remains something suspect. There were texts which were added to ‘*At-Tabaqât*’ after the death of Ibn Sa’d. There may be something missing in the chain of narration.”

And in discussing this narration with the *Muhaddith* Al-Ḥârith al-Ḥasanî, he explained that, in general, when one finds it said that Shu’bah Ibn al-Hajjâj “praised him with goodness”, it relates to the narrator’s religion and not his trustworthiness as a narrator.

A summary of the discussion on the narration from Anas:

1. Nearly all of those who mention it attribute it to “*At-Tabaqât*” by Ibn Sa’d. However, after searching it extensively, I did not find it. Likewise, numerous researchers mentioned that they did not find it in “*At-Tabaqât*”.

2. There is a dispute about the attribution of the narrator from Anas upon five attributions:

- a) As-Salâñî
- b) As-Sabalâñî
- c) As-Saylâñî
- d) As-Sunbulâñî

e) As-Sînânî

3. There is no mention of who Mûsâ's father is
4. He does not have any *Marfû'* narrations
5. He only has two narrations from Anas
6. None of his narrations from Anas are within any of the main books of narration
7. No one other than Shu'bah is known to have narrated from him
8. Only Yaḥyâ Ibn Ma'în declared him *Thiqah*
9. Generally, when Shu'bah praises someone with good, it is related to his religion and not his narrations
10. It is likely Yaḥyâ Ibn Ma'în declaring him trustworthy was due to Shu'bah's praise, as there are no narrations that could be studied to determine his trustworthiness
11. There is no mention of Mûsâ in the books that gather large amounts of biographies, such as "*At-Târîkh al-Kabîr*" by Al-Bukhârî or "*Ath-Thuqât*" by Ibn Ḥibbân
12. The identity of the narrator from Shu'bah ('Alî Ibn Muḥammad) is not clear
13. If 'Alî Ibn Muḥammad is the likely narrator with this name (Al-Madâ'inî), there is a dispute about his trustworthiness
14. The narrator from Ibn Sa'd (Al-Ḥusayn Ibn al-Fahm) is weak
15. The narrator from Al-Ḥusayn Ibn al-Fahm is *Majhûl* (Unknown)

And what kind of ruse is being attempted by these people when their proof is:

1. A narration from Anas which is unconfirmed, and even the only phrasing available does not even match what they claimed and does not contain proof for their opinion.
2. A narration from Sa'îd Ibn al-Musayyib which contains three defects (one of which is the presence of a liar in the chain). In fact, the whole chain between the first and last narrator is defective.
3. A linguistic definition which is not only non-existent, but in fact contrary to what is stated by all linguists.

As for what was mentioned about *Imām* Muslim narrating it in front of *Imām* Abū Zur'ah, then, as far as I know, there is no chain of narration to support this and it is not in any of either of their books or the books of their students. And even if it was, the fact that he narrated it in front of him does not mean it was acceptable according to any rule within the Sciences of *Hadīth*.

### What About *Amîr al-Mu'minîn*, Mu'âwiyah Ibn Abî Sufyân, رضي الله عنه؟

As for the claim that this has nothing to do with Mu'âwiyah and that this group does not hold an opinion regarding Mu'âwiyah, then I say: This does not appear to be true. The reason for this is that they discuss Mu'âwiyah and his not being one of the *Šâhâbah* in their own publications. In fact, the issue of the definition of what a *Šâhâbî* appears in this very context. Therefore, they have no one to blame for this inference, if indeed it is merely an inference and incorrect, but themselves.

In fact, their previous definition of a *Šâhâbî* comes in this exact context. "The *Šâhâbî* and all those whom the meaning of *Šuhbah* is present in – and it has been explained that if he accompanies the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, for a year or two, and battled alongside him in a battle or two. And Mu'âwiyah entered *Islâm* when his age was 13 years old. And it is not narrated that he went to Al-Madînah and lived in it during the lifetime of the Messenger, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and accompanied him. And the Messenger stayed in Makkah for a short amount of time the likes of which the meaning of *Šuhbah* cannot take place in. Therefore, Mu'âwiyah was not a *Šâhâbî*." <sup>24</sup>

### Another False Claim Which Shows Their Dishonesty and Ignorance

And when asked how this would affect or be affected by the fact that Mu'âwiyah has narrated numerous *Aḥâdîth* from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, directly, they have replied: **"All the Ahadith that Mu'awiyah narrated are duplicated in other chains without him. That is why this is not about him. We only care about the definition of a Sahabi, and it doesn't matter who it applies to."**

However, even this claim is false. Mu'âwiyah is the sole narrator of numerous *Aḥâdîth*. Below are some of them:

*Imām* Mâlik narrated:

عَنْ ابْنِ شَهَابٍ عَنْ حُمَيْدِ بْنِ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنِ عَوْفٍ أَنَّهُ سَمَعَ مُعَاوِيَةَ بْنَ أَبِي سُقْيَانَ عَامَ حَجَّ وَهُوَ عَلَى الْمِنْبَرِ وَتَنَاهَىْ فَصَّةً مِنْ شَعِيرٍ كَانَتْ فِي يَدِ حَرَسِيٍّ يَقُولُ يَا أَهْلَ الْمَدِينَةِ أَيْنَ عُلَمَاؤُكُمْ سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَنْهَا عَنْ مِثْلِ هَذِهِ وَيَقُولُ: إِنَّمَا هَلَكَتْ بَنُو إِسْرَائِيلَ حِينَ اخْتَدَّ هَذِهِ نِسَاؤُهُمْ

On the authority of Ibn Shihâb: On the authority of Humayd Ibn 'Abdir-Rahmân Ibn 'Awf: That he heard Mu'âwiyah Ibn Abî Sufyân in the year in which he performed *Hajj*, while he was upon the

<sup>24</sup> "Al-Malaff al-Fikrî", pg. 148

*Minbar:* he took a bunch of hair that was in the hands of a guard, saying: "O People of Al-Madînah: Where are your Scholars? I heard the Messenger of Allâh, ﷺ, forbidding the likes of this and saying: 'Indeed, the Children of Israel were only ruined when their women wore this.'" <sup>25</sup>

And Ibn Abî Shaybah said:

حَدَّثَنَا مُرْخُومٌ بْنُ عَنْدِ الْغَزِيرِ عَنْ أَيِّ نَعَامَةَ السَّعْدِيِّ عَنْ أَيِّ عُثْمَانَ عَنْ أَيِّ سَعِيدِ الْخُدْرِيِّ قَالَ: خَرَجَ مُعَاوِيَةَ عَلَى حَلْقَةٍ فِي الْمَسْجِدِ فَقَالَ: مَا أَجْلَسْتُكُمْ؟ قَالُوا: جَلَسْنَا نَذْكُرُ اللَّهَ. قَالَ: إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَا أَجْلَسَكُمْ إِلَّا ذَاكَ. قَالُوا: وَاللَّهِ مَا أَجْلَسْنَا إِلَّا ذَاكَ. قَالَ: أَمَا إِنِّي لَمْ أَسْتَحْلِفْكُمْ ثُمَّمَ لَكُمْ وَمَا كَانَ أَخْدُ بِمَنْزِلَتِي مِنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَقَلَّ عَنْهُ حَدِيثًا مِّنِي وَإِنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ خَرَجَ عَلَى حَلْقَةٍ مِّنْ أَصْحَابِهِ فَقَالَ: مَا أَجْلَسْتُكُمْ؟ قَالُوا: جَلَسْنَا نَذْكُرُ اللَّهَ وَحَمْدُهُ عَلَى مَا هَدَانَا لِلإِسْلَامِ وَمَنْ بِهِ عَلَيْنَا. قَالَ: إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَا أَجْلَسَكُمْ إِلَّا ذَاكَ". قَالُوا: "وَاللَّهِ مَا أَجْلَسْنَا إِلَّا ذَاكَ". قَالَ: "أَمَا إِنِّي لَمْ أَسْتَحْلِفْكُمْ ثُمَّمَ لَكُمْ وَلَكُنَّهُ أَتَيَنِي جَبْرِيلٌ فَأَخْبَرَنِي أَنَّ اللَّهَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ يُبَاهِي بِكُمُ الْمَلَائِكَةَ".

Marhûm Ibn 'Abdil-'Azîz told us: On the authority of Abû Na'âmah as-Sâ'dî: On the authority of Abû 'Uthmân: On the authority of Abû Sa'îd al-Khudrî who said: "Mu'âwiyah went to a circle in the *Masjid* and said: 'What makes you sit here?' They said: 'We are sitting here in order to remember Allâh.' He said: 'I adjure you by Allâh (to tell me whether you are sitting here for this very purpose)?' They said: 'By Allâh, we are sitting here for this very purpose.' Thereupon, he said: 'I have not demanded you to take an oath because of any allegation against you and none of my rank in the eye of Messenger of Allâh, ﷺ, is the narrator of so few *Ahâdîth* as I am. The fact is that the Messenger of Allâh, ﷺ, went out to the circle of his Companions and said: 'What makes you sit?' They said: 'We are sitting here in order to remember Allâh and to praise Him for He Guided us to the Path of *Islâm* and He conferred favours upon us.' Thereupon he adjured by Allâh and asked if that only was the purpose of their sitting there. They said: 'By Allâh, we are not sitting here but for this very purpose.' Whereupon he (the Messenger) said: 'I am not asking you to take an oath because of any allegation against you but for the fact that Gabriel came to me and he informed me that Allâh, the Exalted and Glorious, was Talking to the angels about your magnificence.'" <sup>26</sup>

And Ibn Abî Shaybah said:

حَدَّثَنَا غُنْدَرٌ عَنْ شُعْبَةَ عَنْ سَعْدِ بْنِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ عَنْ مَعْبِدِ الْجَهْنَمِ عَنْ مُعَاوِيَةَ قَالَ: سَعَيْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ: "إِيَّكُمْ وَالشَّمَادُخُ فِيَّنَهُ الدَّبُخُ".

Ghundar told us: On the authority of Shu'bah: On the authority of Sa'd Ibn Ibrâhîm: On the authority of Ma'bad al-Juhâni: On the authority of Mu'âwiyah who said: I heard the Messenger

<sup>25</sup> "Muwaṭṭa' Mâlik", (#2,726), "Muṣannaf 'Abdir-Razzâq", (#5,095), "Musnad al-Ḥumaydî", (#611), "Musnad Ahmad", (#16,990), "Ṣaḥîḥ al-Bukhârî", (#3,468), "Ṣaḥîḥ Muslim", (#5,629), "Sunan Abî Dâwûd", (#4,127), "Jâmi' at-Tirmidhî", (2,781), "Sunan an-Nasâ'î", (#9,314)

<sup>26</sup> "Muṣannaf Ibn Abî Shaybah", (#30,083), "Musnad Ahmad", (#16,960), "Ṣaḥîḥ Muslim", (#6,956), "Jâmi' at-Tirmidhî", (#3,379), "Sunan an-Nasâ'î", Vol. 8/249 and "Musnad Abî Ya'lâ", (#7,387)

of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, say: “Beware of praising one another, for it is slaughtering (one another).”  
<sup>27</sup>

And *Imâm* Ahmâd said:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ إِسْحَاقَ أَخْبَرَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ الْمُبَارَكِ قَالَ: أَخْبَرَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنُ يَزِيدَ بْنُ جَابِرٍ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنِي أَبُو عَبْدِ رَبِّهِ قَالَ: سَمِعْتُ مُعَاوِيَةَ يَقُولُ عَلَى هَذَا الْمِنْبَرِ: سَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ: إِنَّ مَا بَقَى مِنَ الدُّنْيَا بَلَاءٌ وَفِتْنَةٌ وَإِنَّمَا مَثَلُ عَمَلٍ أَحَدِكُمْ كَمَثَلِ الْوِعَاءِ إِذَا طَابَ أَعْلَاهُ طَابَ أَسْفَلُهُ وَإِذَا حَبُثَ أَعْلَاهُ حَبُثَ أَسْفَلُهُ.

‘Alî Ibn Is’hâq told us: ‘Abdullâh Ibn al-Mubârak informed us saying: ‘Abdur-Râhîmân Ibn Yazîd Ibn Jâbir informed us saying: Abû ‘Abd Rabbih told me saying: I heard Mu’âwiyah upon this *Minbar* saying: I heard the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, saying: “Indeed, what is left from this worldly life is trials and tribulations. And indeed, the likes of any of your deeds is like a container; if the top of it is good, the bottom of it is good. And if the top of it is bad, the bottom of it is bad.”<sup>28</sup>

*Imâm* ‘Abdur-Razzâq narrated:

عَنْ ابْنِ جُرَيْجِ قَالَ: أَخْبَرَنِي عُمَرُ بْنُ عَطَاءِ بْنِ أَبِي الْحُوَارِ عَنِ السَّائِبِ بْنِ يَزِيدَ أَخْبَرَهُ قَالَ: صَلَّيْتُ الْجُمُعَةَ مَعَ مُعَاوِيَةَ فِي الْمَقْصُورَةِ فَلَمَّا سَلَّمَ قُمْتُ مَقَامِي فَصَلَّيْتُ فَلَمَّا دَخَلَ أَرْسَلَ إِلَيَّ فَقَالَ: لَا تَعْدُ لِمَا فَعَلْتَ إِذَا صَلَّيْتَ الْجُمُعَةَ فَلَا تُصَلِّهَا حَقًّا تَكَلَّمُ أَوْ تَخْرُجُ فَإِنَّ نَبِيَّ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَمَرَ بِذَلِكَ.

On the authority of Ibn Jurayj who said: ‘Umar Ibn ‘Atâ’ Ibn Abil-Khuwâr informed me: On the authority of As-Sâ’ib Ibn Yazîd who informed him, saying: I prayed the *Jumu’ah* prayer along with Mu’âwiyah in the *Maqṣûrah*.<sup>29</sup> Then when he performed the *Salâm*, I stood up at my place and performed *Şalât*. As he entered (the apartment) he sent for me and said: “Do not repeat what you have done. When you have pray the *Jumu’ah* prayer, do not connect another prayer to it until you have spoken or gone out, as the Prophet of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, commanded that.”<sup>30</sup>

Now, they may claim that the meaning of these *Aḥâdîth* has come in *Aḥâdîth* from other *Şâhâbah*, even if the exact wording has not come from them. I say: This is indeed the case for some of the *Aḥâdîth*, but not all of them.

And even for those which there are other *Aḥâdîth* with the same meaning or a similar meaning, the fact of the matter is that Mu’âwiyah is the sole narrator of these *Aḥâdîth*, which disproves this laughable claim.

<sup>27</sup> “Muṣannaf Ibn Abî Shaybah”, (#26,786), “Musnad Abî Dâwûd at-Tayâlîsî”, (#1,048) and “Sunan Ibn Mâjah”, (#3,743)

<sup>28</sup> “Musnad Ahmâd”, (#16,978), “Musnad ‘Abd Ibn Humayd”, (#414), “Sunan Ibn Mâjah”, (#4035), and “Musnad Abî Ya’lâ”, (#7,362)

<sup>29</sup> A *Maqṣûrah* is an area dedicated for the *Imâm* which is cordoned off to prevent attacks on the *Imâm*.

<sup>30</sup> “Muṣannaf ‘Abdur-Razzâq”, (#3,916), “Muṣannaf Ibn Abî Shaybah”, (#5,469), “Musnad Ahmâd”, (#16,991), “Şâhîh Muslim”, (#1,997), “Sunan Abî Dâwûd”, (#1,129) and “Musnad Abî Ya’lâ”, (#7,356)

## صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ As the Scribe of the Messenger of Allâh, رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Imâm Ahmad said:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ حَدَّثَنِي الْوَلِيدُ بْنُ مُسْلِمٍ حَدَّثَنِي عَبْدُ الرَّحْمَنِ بْنُ يَزِيدَ بْنِ جَابِرٍ قَالَ حَدَّثَنِي رَبِيعَةُ بْنُ يَزِيدَ حَدَّثَنِي أَبُو كَبْشَةَ السَّلْوَلِيُّ أَنَّهُ سَمِعَ سَهْلَ ابْنَ الْحَنْظَلِيَّةَ الْأَنْصَارِيَّ صَاحِبَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَنَّ عُيَيْنَةَ وَالْأَقْرَعَ سَلَّا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ شَيْئًا فَأَمَرَ مُعَاوِيَةَ أَنْ يَكْتُبَ بِهِ لَهُمَا فَفَعَلَ وَخَتَمَهَا رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَأَمَرَ بِدَفْعِهِ إِلَيْهِمَا فَأَمَّا عُيَيْنَةُ فَقَالَ مَا فِيهِ قَالَ فِيهِ الَّذِي أُمِرْتُ بِهِ فَقَبَّلَهُ وَعَقَدَهُ فِي عِمَامَتِهِ ...

'Alî Ibn 'Abdillâh told us: Al-Walîd Ibn Muslim told me: Abdur-Rahmân Ibn Yazîd Ibn Jâbir told me, saying: Rabî'ah Ibn Yazîd told me: Abû Kabshah as-Salûlî told me: That he heard Sahl Ibn al-Hanthaliyyah, the Companion of the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, that 'Uyaynah and Al-Aqra' both asked the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, something, so he commanded Mu'âwiya, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, to write it for them. So, he did so and the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, stamped it and commanded that it be given to them. As for 'Uyaynah, then he said: "What is in it?" He said: "In it is what I was commanded with." So, he accepted it and wrapped it in his turban... <sup>31</sup>

### General Trend

Lastly, there is a trend you will notice with this individual and others in this group. When someone disagrees with an opinion they hold, they will say they "...recklessly attack their Muslim brothers out of ignorance, impatience, and lack of research.

That they are "...making a fuss...", that they are "shallow individuals", "...too dense to comprehend a simple explanation"

In fact, they will even attack the person's intention and accuse them of matters which could reach the level of disbelief, such as "they think that by attacking side issues they will somehow hinder the success of the work to re-establish the Khilafah".

Yet, when others make statements that are far less insulting, they will respond with statements like: "Try learning to be respectful, rather than always assuming the worst in your brother."

And as you've seen, they will accuse some of the greatest of the Scholars of *Islâm* of following "little more than an assumption" and claim that their opinion is in fact "a mystical assumption".

And they even make laughable statements like: "If you wish to choose the definition where anyone who merely saw the Prophet (saw) is magically transformed into a Sahabi..."

<sup>31</sup> "Musnad Ahmad", (#17,775) and "Sunan Abî Dâwûd", (#1,629)

And of all things for these types of individuals to accuse others of lack of research is the most absurd.

### **Conclusion**

It was claimed that there was no Textual Evidence to support the opinion that someone seeing the Messenger of Allâh, ﷺ, made him a Companion and that it was a “mystical assumption”, and this was proven false.

It was claimed that this opinion is not supported by the Language of the ‘Arab and that the opinion espoused by this group is, and this was proven to be a falsified claim.

It was claimed that their opinion was held by Sa’îd Ibn al-Musayyib, and this was proven to be a fabrication.

In was claimed that Mu’âwiyah was not a Companion, and this was proven to be contrary to the Texts and the Language of the ‘Arab.

After this, I don’t know how anyone could take this group in general and this individual in particular, seriously or trust anything they say?

And Allâh Knows Best.

Abû Tâlût Haytham Âl Sayfaddîn